REMARKS

This paper is filed in response to the final official action dated August 3, 2009 (hereafter, "the official action"). This paper is timely filed.

Claims 57-88 are pending but claims 74, 76, and 78-86 have been withdrawn as directed to a non-elected embodiment. Claims 57, 58, 60, 62-73, 75, 77, 87, and 88 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as assertedly anticipated by or obvious over U.S. Publication 2002/0079512 to Yamazaki et al. Claims 59 and 61 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as assertedly obvious over U.S. Publication 2002/0079512 to Yamazaki et al. and WO 99/49525 to Petritsch et al.

By the foregoing, claims 57 and 88 has been amended. No change in scope is intended or effected; rather, these amendments clarify the claimed invention. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

Additionally, it is respectfully submitted that the accompanying amendments are proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 practice and should be entered because the rejections set forth in the previous official action have been overcome. Moreover, these amendments should be entered because they do not present new issues requiring further consideration or search. Finally, the amendments should be entered because they place the application in condition for allowance (or in better condition for appeal).

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §102(E)/ 35 U.S.C. §103(A)

Claims 57, 58, 60, 62-73, 75, 77, 87, and 88 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as assertedly anticipated by, or as assertedly obvious over Yamazaki. Claims 59 and 61 have been rejected as assertedly obvious over Yamakazi in view of Petritsch. The applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 57 recites a combined information display and information input device comprising a matrix of independently addressable light emitting devices and a plurality of light sensing devices, said light emitting devices comprising organic light emitting diodes comprising organic light emitting material positioned between a low work function electrode formed from a low work function material layer and a high work function electrode formed from a high work function material layer, and said light sensing devices comprising organic photovoltaic devices comprising at least an

organic electron donor and at least an organic electron acceptor positioned between a high work function electrode formed from a high work function material layer and a low work function electrode formed from a low work function material layer, wherein the light emitting devices and the light sensing devices are disposed on a common substrate, and the high work function electrode of both the light emitting devices and the light sensing devices is formed from the same high work function layer and/or the low work function electrode of both the light emitting devices and the light sensing devices is formed from the same low work function layer.

It is respectfully submitted that the examiner's comments regarding capacitive or electrical sharing of the layers have been addressed by the claim amendments presented herein, which clarify that *the high work function electrode of both the light emitting devices and the light sensing devices is formed from the same high work function layer* and/or *the low work function electrode of both the light emitting devices and the light sensing devices is formed from the same low work function layer*. Such sharing of high work function and/or low work function layers is not present or even possible in the Yamakazi device.

In Yamakazi, the anodes of the light emitting devices and the light sensing devices are provided as separate layers, and thus are not formed from the same high work function layer, as claimed. Similarly, in Yamakazi, the cathodes of the light emitting devices and the light sensing devices are provided as separate layers, and thus are also not formed from the same low work function layer, as claimed. This can be seen, for example, in Figure 4 of Yamakazi in which the anode 406 of the photodiode 421 is formed in a separate layer relative to the anode 409 of the EL element 422. Similarly, the cathode 408 of the photodiode 421 is formed in a separate layer relative to the cathode 411 of the EL element 422.

As described in the second full paragraph on page 1 of the present application, displays which require overlying layers for emission and sensing have the disadvantage that the introduction of further layers in addition to those of the display itself adds to the complexity of the display. Additional layers also increase the thickness of the display and thereby increase light absorption within the display. These very same problems occur in the arrangement disclosed in Yamakazi.

In contrast to Yamakazi, the claimed invention provides a combined information display and information input device which includes at least one common electrode formed from the same layer in both the light emitting and light sensing devices. For example, Figures 4a to 4g of the present application, illustrate an embodiment wherein anode 402 is formed from the same high work function layer in both the sensing and emitting devices and cathode 408 is formed from the same low work function layer in both the sensing and emitting devices. It is advantageous to provide the two different sensing and emitting devices on a common substrate surface while depositing certain common electrode layers using the same material as these common electrode layers can advantageously be deposited in a single deposition step. In Yamakazi, the sensing and emitting devices are disposed on different layers and manufactured in separate and distinct processes, and there is no recognition that at least one electrode can be formed from the same layer in both the sensing and emitting devices, as claimed. Accordingly, the claimed invention is not anticipated by, or obvious over Yamakazi.

Petritsch was merely cited for its disclosure of organic electron donors and organic electron acceptors and thus adds nothing further to the above analysis.

In view of the above, the applicants respectfully submit that the outstanding rejections as anticipated by, or obvious over Yamakazi should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing, or any matter of form or procedure in an effort to advance this application to allowance, he is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

November 3, 2009

Andrew M. Lawrence, Reg. No. 46,130
Attorney for Applicants
6300 Sears Tower
233 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300